

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Gilhousen, et al. (USPN 6,421,540). Claims 11-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Corrigan, et al. (USPN 5,818,825). Claims 11 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vannucci (USPN 5,459,727). Claims 5-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilhousen, et al. (USPN 6,421,540) in view of Rahnema (USPN 5,465,253). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilhousen, et al. (USPN 6,421,540) in view of Jang, et al. (US 2003/0211847). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilhousen, et al. (USPN 6,421,540) in view of Rahnema (USPN 5,465,253) and Jang, et al. (US 2003/0211847).

Every claim in Applicants' application has been amended to clarify the invention. Specifically, independent Claim 1 has been amended to add the limitation of allowable Claim 3. As such, all claims dependent upon allowable Claim 1, namely Claims 4-10, should also be allowable.

Further, independent Claim 11 has been amended to add a limitation to clarify the element of "reverse channel signaling." The limitation is described as "wherein the reverse channel signaling is transmitted in a shared signaling field on a second channel on an outbound path while the second channel supports a first call and the first channel supports a second call." Support for this limitation is found in a number of places in the Applicant's specification, including on page 1, lines 1-7 and page 3, lines 16-18. Thus, no new matter is added by the amendment. This clarifying limitation is not found in the prior art, either alone or in combination. Thus, all claims dependent upon amended Claim 11, namely Claims 12, 14, and 16, should be allowable.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.


The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number

indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,



SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:  
Motorola, Inc.  
Intellectual Property Section  
Law Department  
1303 E. Algonquin Road  
Schaumburg, IL 60196

Indira Saladi  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 45,759  
Telephone:(847) 576-6735  
Fax No.: (847) 576-0721